

REMARKS

Claims 1-70 are pending in the application. Claims 16, 21, and 22 are being amended to overcome the objections in part 4 of the Office Action at hand. Applicant thanks Examiner for the suggestions. No new matter is being introduced.

Before responding to the specific rejections, Applicant believes a brief description of the invention as recited in claim 1 and the primary cited reference, Manohar et al. (U.S. 6,572,662) ("Manohar"), may be useful.

Applicant discloses a method and corresponding system for providing statistical information on a webpage to a website developer trying to understand visitor navigation of the web page. The statistical information is presented to the developer in the form of "displaying the page to present statistical information associated with a hyperlink at the hyperlink on the page," as recited in Claim 1 as originally filed.

Manohar solves a different problem, namely providing a way to customize tours for touring clients who want to take a tour of Internet Web objects (e.g., webpages) (col. 1, lines 43-col. 2, line 6; col. 2, lines 52-55; and col. 3, lines 46-49; and col. 9, lines 49-67)). In organizing a customized tour, Manohar may save and present information to a present touring client about other touring clients' touring behavior (col. 4, lines 4-28). The information can be in the form of statistics. The statistics may be presented to the present touring client for use in deciding how to customize his or her own tour.

Fig. 19 of Manohar illustrates an "anchor page" with a control panel listing options in the form of radio control buttons (col. 15, lines 42-64). The statistics are displayed near the radio control buttons to assist a present touring client in customizing a tour. The buttons are not hyperlinks, however; the buttons are merely controls for selecting touring options for the tour. The selected options are forwarded to a touring server for analysis and dynamic customization of the present touring client's touring experience (col. 15, lines 50-54). It is noted that (i) the anchor page is not a webpage with hyperlinks that is displayed on a tour to a touring client and (ii) Manohar does not disclose a webpage having hyperlinks and statistical information.

Thus, Manohar is providing a customized tour of Web objects (e.g., webpages), where the customization may be based on the touring client's selection of an option at an anchor page, but there is no suggestion by Manohar to present "statistical information with a hyperlink at the hyperlink on the page," as recited in Applicant's claim 1 as originally filed.

Referring now to the specific rejections, claims 1-6, 10, 12-22, 23-28, 32, 34-51, 55, 57-67, and 68-70 were rejected in part 6 of the Office Action at hand under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Manohar.

For reasons presented above in reference to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's claim 1 is prima facie non-obvious over Manohar, and, therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Moreover, on page 3 of the Office Action at hand with regard to claim 1, the Office Action states, in reference to Figs. 19 and 20 (col. 15, line 42 through col. 16, line 47), "it was well known at the time of the invention that all of the form elements (options) are used in conjunction with each other to operate as one unified hyperlink." To characterize the form elements, which are used to enter a touring client's input, as "one unified hyperlink" is improper since the form elements are non-hyperlink options buttons that are not hyperlinks; therefore, such characterization would add new matter to what was disclosed by Manohar.

Accordingly, Applicant further respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn as to claim 1 for this reason as well.

Independent claims 23, 45, 46, 47, and 68-70 include similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, the arguments above apply, and Applicant respectfully submits that these claims should be allowed under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for similar reasons over Manohar.

Because claims 2-6, 10, 12-22, 24-28, 32, 34-44, 48-51, 55, and 57-67 depend from the independent claims, these claims should be allowed under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for at least the same reasons.

Claims 7, 11, 29, 33, 52, and 56 were rejected in part 7 of the Office Action at hand under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manohar as applied to claims 20, 42 and 65 and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. 6,088,707) ("Bates"). Because claims 7, 11, 29, 33, 52 and 56 depend from the independent claims and Bates is being applied against the limitations of the

dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above.

Claims 8-9, 30-31, and 53-54 were rejected in part 8 of the Office Action at hand under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manohar as applied to claims 1, 23, and 47 and further in view of Sandifer (U.S. 5,778,381). Because claims 8-9, 30-31, and 53-54 depend from the independent claims and Sandifer is being applied against the limitations of the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (claims 1-70) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon
Mark B. Solomon
Registration No. 44,348
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 1/28/05